

cial problem, New York has at last accumulated enough recorded experience and disgrace to arrive at sound conclusions as to what human nature will do under conditions of civic neglect. As an exemplar of municipal cowardice, she has encouraged corruption in other large cities of the country; now, as an aroused community, she is pricking the consciences of the sister cities. If she takes the plain and obvious course to purify her own political life, and to keep it pure, the politics of the whole country will be lifted to a higher plane of honesty and honor.

As the causes of corruption in the large cities are primarily the same, so the cure must be the same. Those citizens who are most favorably situated as to the opportunities of education and property, in addition to carrying the heaviest end of the burden of taxation, must attend to the drudgery of politics, and show by an enlightened public spirit that the business affairs of a municipality are worthy of self-sacrifice.

Also it must be understood, and enforced by practice, that the poorest system of municipal administration will do more for the public good with an honest, self-dependent man at the head of it, than the best system with a depraved or ignorant tool of a political boss at the helm. An unworthy head at once devitalizes a municipal organization, no matter what the clime, race, confusion of races, or form of government.

Municipal corruption always spreads from the controlling official through his executive agents into the body of the people; and it is the merest sophistry — humorously offered, perhaps — for the ablest organ of Tammany Hall to claim that the police corruption was an infection from dishonest merchants who employed the art of bribery to prevent the enforcement of troublesome laws. It is no excuse for a police officer who falls, that bribers were lying in wait for him; he was commissioned to go forth in the name of the municipality to wage war on thieves and lawbreakers, and to

nip the amateur malefactor in the bud. But how can he be expected to do his duty if he sees that the mayor at the top is a figurehead for a ring which in every attribute and act shows that it is organized and run for the spoils of office and the plunder to be got from extortion and blackmail? Woe to the city whose mayor is the product of its political slums; woe to the city whose mayor, though honest in himself, is the creature of the boss of its political slums.

And finally, the cure of municipal corruption depends upon the elimination of the irresponsible boss. No public officer can serve two masters; and there never was and never can be good government through boss rule. There will always be a dominating personality in every political organization — municipal, State, or national; and any citizen may laudably aspire to wield such an influence. But public sentiment should demand that the boss of a party shall assume through the ballot-box the highest official responsibility that his party is able to confer.

Suppose that the recent "leader," on coming into the dictatorship of Tammany Hall, had been forced by public sentiment to take his own nomination for mayor. Either he would have dwindled into a harmless suppliant for public favor, as when he was compelled by his own predecessor as boss to run for alderman; or he would have justified his right to govern New York. What he did do was to learn by sore experience that Mr. Hewitt was not the mayor to serve him rather than the public, and then to put forward one mayor more amenable to his behests than another, until he had piled on the city as much degradation as suited his personal ends, and more than had ever been known in the annals of municipal martyrdom.

The only way, then, to rid municipal life of political hirelings is to compel jobbing statesmen to vindicate their right to manage public affairs by a direct appeal to the ballot-box, which they shun as the devil does holy water.

OPEN LETTERS.

A Grave of Heroes at Chattanooga.

SOME time ago the writer and some friends were discussing an article in "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War," entitled, "The Locomotive Chase in Georgia," when one of the party remarked, "Those men deserve a monument!" Thereupon I told them of the monument to their memory as the story was told to me in June, 1891, by the officer in charge of the National Cemetery at Chattanooga, as follows:

J. J. Andrews and twenty-one others, one of whom was a civilian, entered upon their dangerous mission with every prospect of success, but the inclemency of the weather caused a postponement of the effort for one day, a delay which proved fatal to the result of the enterprise. The road was crowded with trains. The pursuit was vigorous and persistent. The expedition resulted in disaster and death. Sixteen were captured, and six escaped. Of the captured, eight, among whom was the leader of the party, were tried and convicted as spies. Some of these were executed at Chattanooga and some at Atlanta. The others were afterward exchanged. After the war had

ended the bodies of those executed were removed to the National Cemetery at Chattanooga. When the body of Andrews was disinterred at Atlanta the shackles were still upon his limbs, and the rope with which he was hanged was around his neck.

The participants in the expedition were all from the State of Ohio, and years afterward — I think in 1889 — the legislature of that State appropriated \$5000 for the purpose of erecting a monument to their memory. A pleasant spot in the cemetery was secured, and the monument was erected. It is of granite, and is surmounted by a miniature image in bronze of the "General," the stolen engine. The monument was unveiled with appropriate ceremonies on Decoration Day, 1891. On one face of the monument is a history of the expedition; on another face are the names of those members of the party who were executed; on another, the names of those who were exchanged; and on the other, the names of those who escaped. Opposite each face of the monument are the graves of two of the dead.

There were present at the ceremonies two of the survivors of that desperate "race," and one or two of their captors. When the exercises were ended they met upon the platform and shook hands. It was the meeting of brave men. There were relatives of the dead from far-away States, among them two women who had come to

visit, for the first time, the grave of a brother. One of them, in an attempt to pluck some flowers from her brother's grave, was stopped by a guard, and immediately burst into tears. A word of explanation was given, and her hands were filled with roses.

The monument is located in one of the prettiest parts of the cemetery, and is one of the objects of interest to the visitor to that "city of the dead." Loving hands cover each grave with flowers. Surrounded by thousands of "unknown" comrades from distant battlefields, beneath the shadows of Lookout Mountain and Missionary Ridge, they "sleep the sleep that knows no waking."

George H. Fair.

Noah Brooks's References to Charles Sumner.

MR. NOAH BROOKS makes two statements concerning Charles Sumner in *THE CENTURY* for last November, p. 145, which I desire to challenge. The first is that Mr. Sumner, before delivering his speeches, read them before a glass, "studying the effect of his gestures by the light of lamps placed at each side of the mirror." This he does not pretend to have himself seen, or to have been so informed by any one who had seen it, but more than forty years afterward he first publishes it as reported to him by a "Mr. Gardner, the aged custodian of the house," long since dead, who was so told by "younger members of the family," who are unnamed and unidentified. One question is if any credence can be placed in American history for the last half-century if it is to be built on such foundations. If any one thing is unmistakable, it is that Washington gossip is not history.

Mr. Brooks's indifference to accurate statement is apparent in his quotation of a reference to such a habit of Mr. Sumner, which he attributes to "Senator Butler of South Carolina," who never made such a reference. One somewhat like it was made by Senator Douglas (though Mr. Brooks's quotation does not follow the "Congressional Globe") in the Senate, May 20, 1856. Mr. Sumner thought the absurdity of such a story so apparent on its face that he included it in his published works, Vol. IV, p. 249, as a part of Douglas's remarks, thus dismissing it with the silent contempt it deserved.

Mr. Sumner, it may be remarked, used no gestures which appeared to have been trained, and those he did use were the least attractive part of his public speaking. Edward Everett and Wendell Phillips were distinguished for their effective gestures, but not so with such orators as Mr. Sumner and Phillips Brooks.

Living persons who were witnesses of Mr. Sumner's home life, sleeping in his house or passing much of the day in it, never observed him doing what Mr. Brooks imputes to him. His secretaries (except E. J. Holmes, who was with him only a year) are all living, and are well known,—A. B. Johnson, chief clerk of the Lighthouse Board at Washington; Charles C. Beaman, of the New York bar; and Francis V. Balch and Moorfield Storey, both of the Boston bar. All these gentlemen, after an examination of Mr. Brooks's article, concur in the statement that he had no such practice. Mr. Beaman writes: "I never saw him do any such thing, nor ever heard of it, and do not believe he ever did it." Mr. Balch writes: "I certainly never saw such a thing, and I was with him at all hours and constantly." Mr. Storey, who lived in Mr. Sumner's house,

writes: "The suggestion that he practised his gestures before a glass is, I am satisfied, without the least foundation." Mr. Johnson's denial of such a habit is equally explicit.

Mr. Brooks's other statement is that Mr. Sumner "would graciously receive and entertain men whose experience or mental acquisitions could be utilized, and when he had, as it were, squeezed dry his prize, he would toss it aside with delightful abandon"; and he gives as an illustration "Captain Bulkely, of the United States revenue marine service," who, as he states, supplied materials for Mr. Sumner's speech on Alaska in 1867, at which time he was "a favorite guest for a few days at the senator's house," but whom the senator "failed to recognize when they subsequently met." This story is against all probabilities, and will not bear scrutiny.

No person of the name of Bulkely has at any time been connected with the revenue marine, technically known as the revenue cutter service. I have before me the official certificate of the Treasury Department which says: "The records of the department fail to show that there was at any time an officer named Bulkely connected with the revenue cutter service." Mr. Brooks's fidelity as a narrator is again impeached.

After some search I have, as I suppose, identified the person referred to. Mr. Sumner, in his Alaska speech, mentions Captain Charles S. Bulkely as director of the Russian American Telegraph Company, not naming, however, any contributions from him, but emphasizing in the connection the important services of Major Kennicott, who accompanied the telegraph force in a different capacity. Mr. Sumner, in his difficult research for materials as to a territory then little known, sought information from all available sources, particularly from the Smithsonian Institution. I have in my possession several letters addressed to him on the subject, but no Captain Bulkely appears among the writers. Mr. Beaman was then Mr. Sumner's secretary, and under his direction was employed for some weeks in search of information on all points concerning the territory. He has still in his possession the half-sheet of paper containing the only notes which the senator used in his speech, and also the manuscript of the speech as finally written out. Such was his interest in the question that shortly afterward he published an article upon it in a magazine; but with all his intimate connection with Mr. Sumner's investigation, he recalls no such person as "Captain Bulkely" having had anything to do with it. The conclusion is that if any "Captain Bulkely" ever had a conference with Mr. Sumner on the subject, his service must have been very unimportant, except in his own estimation.

Mr. Brooks's statement that Bulkely was "a guest for a few days at the senator's house" is altogether improbable. It was the season—that of 1866-67—when Mr. Sumner occupied the Pomeroy House, which was filled by his own family.

The serious imputation of Mr. Brooks's article is that Mr. Sumner was altogether indifferent to the obligations of friendship, and treated ungratefully those who had rendered him valuable service. Such an imputation is contrary to his entire conduct from youth to age. His biography abounds in instances of his constant and lifelong devotion to friends. He had no quality of character which was more conspicuous. No house in

Washington, while he had one, was so open as his to all from early morning to midnight. Some *contretemps* might occur now and then (one is mentioned in his *Memoirs*, Vol. IV, p. 95) whereby his best friend might fail to be admitted to his study, or be passed unobserved in the street. That happens with all public men, and with many of humbler sphere; and is an incident of no account, where no explanation has been sought. Forney, who knew Washington as well as Mr. Brooks knew it, and Mr. Sumner much better, says in his "Anecdotes of Public Men": "For a busy man he [Mr. Sumner] was the most accessible I ever knew. I never knew a man less moved by selfish instincts." Mr. Balch writes: "The statements quoted from THE CENTURY seem to me contrary to the nature of the man. He was generous; I don't believe he had a mean fiber in him. He would have been certain, in my judgment, to give full credit for any assistance." Mr. Beaman writes: "In my experience with him, I never knew him to be rude or impolite to any one, and cannot think it possible that after he obtained information from a gentleman he should do anything else than to treat him afterward in a gentlemanly manner." Mr. Johnson writes: "I deny emphatically the charge that he was in the habit of 'squeezing' people, and giving them no credit. I assert that he gave abundant credit to every one from whom he got original data. That was his habit, and he carried it to a painful extent." Mr. Storey writes, and with his emphatic testimony I conclude: "So far from failing to recognize other men's labors, it always seemed to me that he was very generous in this matter. Certainly in the *Alabama* case he took very great pains to bring Mr. Bemis into prominence, and to give him credit for his great familiarity with that subject and his ability to deal with it. To me I know he was very generous; and I have always felt greatly indebted to him on that account. The idea that he would fail to recognize a person who stayed in his house from any intention is absurd. I know that he was singularly considerate of other people, and one of the kindest and most generous of men; and as unwilling wantonly to show any rudeness as any man I ever saw. If he ever failed to recognize a person, it was from cause; and if there is any foundation for the story, it must be that he passed the gentleman in question while he was busy thinking of other matters, and did not see him — an accident which happens to every man, and which is frequently misunderstood."

Edward L. Pierce.

Mr. Brooks's Rejoinder.

I CAN hardly believe that Mr. Pierce would willingly give the impression that certain of the personages referred to in my reminiscences of Senator Sumner are mythical, and their narratives mere figments of the imagination. Yet that is precisely the kind of impression which his letter (written in the fervor of his zeal for Mr. Sumner's fame) would be likely to make on the minds of men who do not know me or my work.

The person to whom Mr. Pierce slightly refers as "a Mr. Gardner" is the man whom we find mentioned in Mr. Pierce's admirable book, "Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner," Vol. III, page 259, as follows: "Sumner's lodgings in Washington, engaged at a visit he made there in October for the purpose,

were at D. A. Gardner's, New York Avenue, between Fifteenth and Sixteenth streets, on the same floor with the street." This was in 1851; and, as I took pains to say in my paper in the November CENTURY, I subsequently succeeded Mr. Sumner as tenant in these rooms; and the excellent Mr. Gardner was wont to entertain my room-mate and myself with reminiscences of the great senator, whom he admired and respected. I should suppose that any reader (not very careless) would see at once that in my November CENTURY paper Mr. Gardner was my authority for the anecdote of Mr. Sumner's practice of rehearsing his speeches in his rooms. My room-mate, Mr. W. E. McArthur (now living in Brooklyn, at No. 19 Jefferson Avenue) authorizes me to say that his memory perfectly agrees with mine in this matter, and that Mr. Gardner, among other things told us of Mr. Sumner, said that the family knew, when the senator made a requisition for additional lamp-light, that he was preparing an important speech; and that his young daughters, "with a curiosity natural to youth," were accustomed to watch, from the rear windows of the apartment, the senator rehearsing before the pier-glass fixed between the windows in front, with a lamp on either side of him.

It was this entirely natural practice, as I then thought, and as I still think, which gave Mr. Sumner's enemies occasion to say that he "was in the habit of rehearsing his speeches before a looking-glass, with a nigger holding a lamp on each side of him." It was reserved for Senator Douglas, however, to refer to this very common but absurd report in a public speech. According to Mr. Pierce (see his book, Vol. III, page 453), Mr. Douglas said that Mr. Sumner was in the habit of "practising his speech every night before the glass, with a negro boy to hold the candle and watch the gestures," which is a very different statement from that which I have ascribed to Senator Butler of South Carolina. The main fact remains that Mr. D. A. Gardner, Mr. Sumner's landlord, told the story as I have told it in the November number of THE CENTURY.

Captain (sometimes called Colonel) Bulkely is also a real person, although he is not mentioned, so far as I know, in that admirable book, "Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner," by Edward L. Pierce. Colonel Bulkely, according to the best of my knowledge, was employed in the revenue marine service at the close of the war, and immediately before that period, with headquarters at San Francisco. My acquaintance with him began in 1865, and along there, while I was naval officer of the port. At one time Colonel Bulkely was, by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, sent to Alaska in the revenue cutter *Shubrick*, Captain Scammon, to examine that coast and the Aleutian chain of islands, with the view of ascertaining the most feasible route for our international telegraph cable. It was on that expedition that he secured the information which he subsequently imparted to Mr. Sumner, as described in my paper in the November CENTURY. Colonel Bulkely was an honorable gentleman whom I knew well, and whose word was never doubted by any who knew him. Colonel Charles James, who was collector of the port of San Francisco when Colonel Bulkely was sent to Alaska, and who executed the orders of the Secretary of the Treasury in the detail of the *Shubrick*, is now living in Washington (at No.

518 South Carolina Avenue), and he authorizes me to say that his memory agrees with mine in every particular as regards the transactions above referred to, in which Colonel Bulkely had part.

Noah Brooks.

The Whipping-Post for Tramps.

BY THE MAYOR OF INDIANAPOLIS.

WHAT to do with tramps is a very serious question. The answer should be one of business, and not of sentiment, for the conditions are already alarming. Tramps have multiplied enormously during the last decade. Thousands of young men and boys are annually joining the ranks of the "sturdy beggars" rather than work. The time is ripe for some heroic action that will deter at least the youth of the land from launching upon a life of vagabondage. If the local authorities cannot stamp out this growing evil, then the National Government must come to the rescue. Every form of organized government owes it to the honest laboring classes to protect them and their families from these pests of society. Vagabondage has no right to claim an existence in this country. If it has no moral standing, then it should have no legal protection. The man of sound body who makes up his mind to sponge his way through life is an enemy to civilization and society.

As a punishment for trampism, Mr. Josiah Flynt, in his interesting letter published in your September number, suggests imprisonment in the workhouse and penitentiary. I cannot agree with him. Workhouses are comparatively few in most of the States. In many that do exist the authorities do not furnish the amount and kind of work to cure the average tramp of his mode of life. The penitentiary is intended for men of criminal instincts, who are dangerous to society — not for idlers. It is not a proper place to teach loafers habits of industry.

I would substitute the whipping-post for the prison. I know the sentimentalist will not agree with me, and I doubt whether very many persons of any class of society would at first approve a return to the lash as a punishment for crime of any kind. It has retained its place in one State for wife-beaters, however, and its preventive effect on that class of brutes is exceedingly efficacious. The tramp deserves no kindlier consideration than the wife-beater.

But will the States enact laws establishing the whipping-post for tramps? Perhaps few will do so at first. After observing the effect of a few practical tests, however, I do not believe the legislature of a single State would decline to sanction flogging as a punishment for cases of confirmed vagabondage. It cannot be said that public opinion has ever pronounced against the whipping-post as a punishment for trampism, for it was discarded long before the modern tramp was heard of. Besides, sentiment should not stand in the way of stamping out this growing evil. At the present rate of increase, the next generation will find trampism the greatest curse this country has ever known, with the possible exceptions of human slavery and alcoholism. To put an end to it by any method, therefore, will justify the means. The cat, well applied, will do it. I do not believe any other punishment that is likely to be adopted will.

We had a practical demonstration of the efficacy of the whip used upon the backs of roving bands of vaga-

bonds in this city (Indianapolis) a few years ago. At the time referred to the writer presided in the police court, that being one of the mayor's duties under the old law. It was winter. Tramps headed this way from all directions. The city was overrun with them. Many were arrested and sent to the workhouse. It became crowded with them and other classes of offenders. Very little work was provided for the prisoners, so that the workhouse was just what the average tramp was seeking. I stopped sending them there, and, when brought before me, took promises from them to leave the city. Few such promises were kept. The tramps would beg lodging at the station-house, and, if refused, would trespass upon private property, most of them sleeping in freight-cars. The situation became serious. Something had to be done. The police were ready for anything. I asked them to quit arresting known tramps, and to drive them out of town, using any force necessary. They obeyed, and the barrel-hoop was freely used for a time. It took only a few days to rid the city of every tramp. They did not return, and no new ones came for many months. Indeed, Indianapolis remained almost free of tramps for some years thereafter. A few other Indiana cities followed our example, with like beneficial results. They had the force of an enlightened public sentiment behind the movement, which, for all practical purposes, was worth as much as a public statute. In fact, public sentiment and approval took the place of law. There were no "white-cap" methods employed. The floggings were administered openly.

The average tramp would rather spend a year in a station-house or jail than take one good flogging. I believe it is the best remedy so far discovered. While it may not cure all the old, hardened tramps of their indolent habits, it will deter the boys from being coaxed "on the road" by them. That is the main thing to be accomplished. If every community had a public whipping-post for tramps, or if the industrious men and women in every city and town would back up the local constabulary in the free use of cowhides on these worthless vagabonds, I do not believe there would be left a tramp of the present American type at the ushering in of the twentieth century.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1894.

C. S. Denny.

P. S. Since the foregoing letter was written, the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children has taken action looking to the enactment of a law providing for corporal punishment of wife-beaters and other like offenders. According to recent accounts in the New York press, such a bill is now in course of preparation. Some of the leading journals of the city have recently approved the general sentiment now taking form on that subject. I have not seen, so far, any specific reference to tramps in connection with the whipping-post discussion. A bill similar to the one being prepared in New York will likely be presented to the Indiana legislature at the present session. If so, an effort will be made to include trampism in the list of offenses thus to be punished.

INDIANAPOLIS, January 15, 1895.

C. S. D.

What has the United States done with Alaska?

ON October 18, 1867, all the Russian possessions in North America were formally transferred to the